

RECEIVED

NOV 9 2023

2:23 CV 3706

JUDGE MARBLEY

US District Court for

the Southern District of Ohio

MAGISTRATE JUDGE JOLSON

James Germatic
plaintiff

v.

Frank LaRose
Ohio Sec of State

Motion to be heard
immediately for the situation
is dire.

Motion for Injunction regarding
Amendment to Ohio Constitution:
Issue

The vote Nov. 7, 2023 on Issue 1 is a fraudulent vote for it circumvents the correct political process. It is a popularity contest between how many people are pro-abortion and how many are against abortion. It is couched in Constitutional terms but it is not Constitutional. To change the Ohio Constitution on an issue people disagree on is to besmirch the purpose of having a Constitution. People change on this issue. One day they are for abortion, the next day they are against it. These are not the kinds of issues that go in a Constitution. They are to be voted on in a legislature where laws are made.

(1)

It circumvents the political process to put this in the Constitution. The Constitution should be a document that endures - is true for all time, not a popularity contest of who can get 50% + 1 of the vote, or even 60%.

It is wrong to put it in the Constitution and this needs to be adjudicated.

Also early voting is wrong. For people have weighed in on this issue already and the whole set up is wrong.

Besides the wrongness of putting a changeable issue in the Constitution is the fact people do not know the rules - that decisions made before constitute precedent, so that even though the wording says one thing - abortions can be prohibited after viability, they do not realize there are decisions (Doe v. Bolton) that overrides that and therefore it means you can have abortions up to 9 months. Also there is no mention of sex change but reproductive rights includes sex change without people knowing it.

Not only are these people putting something deceptive in the Ohio Constitution, but they

are purposely pulling the wool over the electorate's eyes and it has basically become a popularity contest of who believes in abortion and who doesn't.

This needs to be stopped.

Therefore on the basis of this being a fraudulent amendment I ask there be an injunction put on this vote for Issue 1 and this issue of abortion be submitted to the democratic process, the proper venue being the legislature.

Why we are late getting this in:

We needed questions answered on the Supreme Court level. We needed to know how to go about this. I had intentions of getting this in 14 days before the vote of Nov. 7, 2023. But because we needed legal advice we started by going to Notre Dame to go through the Community of Praise to contact Amy Coney Barrett, she having been in this charismatic community and we being charismatic Catholics. We thought they could be a conduit through which we could present these legal questions to her and she could say what she could and could not answer. As it turns out she severed her ties to South Bend, or at least sold her house, and so we were unable to contact her. Then we tried a judge who is pro-life. We gave him the whole complaint but he never answered us. We are on our own and can only rely on God to guide us! But He does and we are doing the best we can to stop this disaster.

Please expedite this request for an injunction to stop the vote on Issue 1 so that a fraudulent, pull-the-wool-over-people's-eyes amendment does not end up in the Ohio Constitution and besmirch the meaning of a Constitution - to give enduring and true guidelines by which to base the (state) government for the uplifting and benefit of the people.

There are more compelling reasons in the Complaint of why either you and/or the Supreme Court should read the whole Complaint and make a decision on it before the vote on November 7, 2023.

In Jesus + Mary,

James Germalik